

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action dated June 29, 2005. Claims 1-15 remain pending in this application. Claim 1 is the only independent claim. Favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

On the merits, the Office Action rejected Claims 1-2, 5, 9-10, and 14-15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable by Benson in view of Page et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,801,787; hereinafter "Page"). The Office Action also rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benson and Page in further view of Amtmann et al. (hereinafter "Amtmann"). The Office Action also rejected Claims 4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benson and Page in further view of Haffenden (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,189; hereinafter "Haffenden"). The Office Action also rejected Claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benson and Page in further view of Raith (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,515; hereinafter "Raith"). The Office Action also rejected Claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benson and Page in further view of Fries (U.S. Patent No. 6,367,701; hereinafter "Fries"). The Office Action also rejected Claim 13 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Benson and Page in further view of Lee (U.S. Patent No. 6,526,287; hereinafter "Lee"). Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejections for at least the following reasons.

The present invention relates generally to methods and apparatus for providing wireless stick-on data carriers to electronic products so that information may be communicated between the wireless stick-on data carrier and the electronic product.

Benson only discloses a wired connection between an internal connection point within a mobile phone and a Subscriber Identification Module (SIM) card disposed in a holder attached to an outer surface of the housing of the mobile phone. Benson's wired connection is made using

very thin flex cable to wire through a gap in the cover of the mobile phone. In view of the deficiencies of Benson, the Examiner cites the disclosure of Page for its teachings of a wireless smart card reader that can be physically coupled to a second electronic apparatus. Applicants respectfully submit that the combination of Benson and Page do not disclose, suggest, or teach the invention defined by Applicants' Claims.

In the previous Response to Office Action, Applicants argued that the combination of Benson and Page does not teach the claimed limitations of two communications means within the same housing, wherein a data carrier detachably connected to that housing can be wirelessly accessed by one of the two communications means so as to provide control information that affects the processing of signals received by the other communications means. In response to Applicants' argument, the Examiner stated that Benson shows two communication means disposed within the housing using the antenna as one of the communication means. *See* Final Office Action 6/29/2005, page 2. The Examiner stated that "[a]s known in the art of wireless communication, the antenna of the mobile phone shown in the stated figures [Benson Figures 1, 3-7, and 8] is a transceiver, which transmits and received data. *See* Final Office Action 6/29/2005, page 2. The Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner regarding the characterization of the antenna in Benson. An antenna is not a transceiver and is not an active device but is instead a passive device that merely serves as a conduit for the signals transmitted and received by the one or more transceivers within the mobile phone. In addition, what appears to be the antenna in Benson Figures 1 and 3-8 is not specifically called out by Benson as an antenna and there is no direct evidence that the antenna is disposed within the housing of the mobile phone. Furthermore, what appears to be the antenna in Benson Figures 1 and 3-8 appears to be external to the housing of the mobile phone. Therefore, even under the Examiner's characterization of the antenna as a transceiver and a communication means, it is not located


within the housing of the mobile phone in Benson and therefore Benson lacks two communication means. Thus Applicants respectfully traverse the § 103(a) rejection of Claim 1 over Benson in view of Page because the references fail to recite, suggest, or teach every limitation recited in Applicants' Claim 1.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner make of record the basis for the assertion that in the art of wireless communications an antenna of a mobile phone is a transceiver.

Claims 2-15 depend from independent Claim 1 discussed above and are believed patentable for at least the same reasons. Applicants further believe the § 103 rejections of Claims 2-15 to be moot in light of the above remarks and request their withdrawal.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the currently pending claims are clearly patentably distinguishable over the cited and applied references. Accordingly, entry of this amendment, reconsideration of the rejections of the claims over the references cited, and allowance of this application is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Adam L. Stroud,
Reg. No. 48,410
Attorney
(408) 474-9064
August 5, 2005